

REMARKS

Initially, Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the recent in-person interview held on July 22. The claim amendments and arguments submitted in this paper are consistent with the amendments and arguments presented during the course of the interview. Accordingly, entry of this amendment and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-12, 14, 16-25, 27 and 29-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mani et al ("Use SOAP-based intermediaries to build chains of Web service functionality," hereinafter *Mani* in view of Mitra et al ("SOAP Version 1.2 Part 0: Primer"), hereinafter *Mitra*. Claims 13, 15, 26 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mani* in view of *Mitra*, and further in view of Examiner's Official Notice.¹

By this amendment claims 1, 18, 32 and 34 have been amended and new claims 39-43 have been added.² Claims 19-22 and 27 has been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-19, 23-27 and 32-43 are pending, of which claims 1, 18, 32 and 34 are the only independent claims at issue.

The present invention is generally directed to dispatching a received message without having direct access to information relevant for the dispatch. For example, claim 1 defines receiving a message at the receiving computing system. Next, claim 1 defines passing the received message through one or more receiving path components that are positioned in the receiving path of the message prior to being passed to the dispatching mechanism, the passing of the received message to the dispatching mechanism occurring within the receiving computing system, each of the receiving path components in the receiving path being components of the receiving computing system. Next, claim 1 defines at least one of the one or more receiving path components modifying the message with at least one modification, the modification including adding information not included in the received message, that is relevant to the dispatch of the message, the information being added during the modification by the dispatching mechanism, the information being used by the dispatching mechanism to dynamically dispatch the message to an appropriate message processing method selected from a group of message processing methods,

¹ Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

² Support for the amendments to the claims are found throughout the specification and previously presented claims, including but not limited to paragraphs [0007], [0027]-[0030] and Figures 2 & 3.

the methods being configured to process the content of the message according to the type of information included in the message.

Claim 1 further defines receiving the modified message from the receiving path within the receiving computing system and evaluating the added information relevant to the dispatch of the message to determine an appropriate message processing method based on those portions of information added to the modified message. Lastly, claim 1 defines, based on the information obtained in the modification, using the obtained information to dynamically dispatch the message to an appropriate message processing method selected from the group of message processing methods within the receiving computing system for further processing, the dispatching comprising transferring the modified received message to the group of message processing methods within the receiving computing system for further specialized message content processing based on the type of information included in the modification.

Claim 18 is a computer program product claim similar to claim 1. Claim 32 is a method claim similar to claim 1 that includes functional language. Claim 34 is a system claim generally corresponding to claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art of record does not anticipate or otherwise render the amended claims unpatentable for at least the reason that the cited art does not disclose, suggest, or enable each and every element of these claims.

35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 Rejections

As discussed during the interview, *Mani* describes a system for passing a SOAP message from a client to a service provider through a series of intermediary servers (see Fig. 2). Each intermediary can add/delete/modify fields in the SOAP message header and thereby change attributes of the message. For example, intermediaries can change the messages intended path by adding new intermediaries to the routing path (p. 2, par. 7). Each intermediary represents a separate computing system. Thus, as Figure 2 illustrates, the SOAP message path begins at a service client computing system, goes through intermediary computing systems A & B, and ends at the destination computing system, the service provider. *Mani* is silent as to what type of processing happens after the message reaches its destination. *Mani* is further silent on adding information to the message that is used to determine which method will process the message upon delivery to its destination. Moreover, *Mani* is silent regarding selecting an appropriate

method from a group of methods based on the type of information included in the modified message.

Mitra is a similar SOAP-related reference. *Mitra* describes the features of SOAP Version 1.2 in a tutorial fashion. On page 18, *Mitra* describes a "role" attribute which can be added in a SOAP message header block that describes the role that is to be played by the intended target of the header block. A SOAP node is required to process a header block if it assumes the role identified by the value of the URI. Further processing depends on which role was assumed and "how a SOAP node assumes a particular role is not a part of the SOAP specification" (Section 3.1, 1st paragraph). Thus, because *Mitra* does not teach how roles are assumed and because SOAP message processing depends on which role was assumed, it cannot be said that *Mitra* teaches selecting an appropriate message processing method selected from a group of message processing methods.

Moreover, while *Mitra* allows an intermediary to insert a header block that qualifies or limits how a request is processed at the application level (Section 5.1, Example 16), *Mitra* fails to teach one or more receiving path components modifying the message with at least one modification, the modification including adding information not included in the received message, that is relevant to the dispatch of the message, the information being added during the modification by the dispatching mechanism, the information being used by the dispatching mechanism to dynamically dispatch the message to an appropriate message processing method selected from a group of message processing methods, the methods being configured to process the content of the message according to the type of information included in the message and the dispatching mechanism evaluating the added information relevant to the dispatch of the message to determine an appropriate message processing method based on those portions of information added to the modified message, as recited in combination with the other limitations of claim 1.

Thus, as discussed during the interview, none of the cited art teaches or suggests one or more receiving path components modifying the message with at least one modification, the modification including adding information not included in the received message, that is relevant to the dispatch of the message, the information being added during the modification by the dispatching mechanism, the information being used by the dispatching mechanism to dynamically dispatch the message to an appropriate message processing method selected from a group of message processing methods, the methods being configured to process the content of

the message according to the type of information included in the message, as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, none of the cited art teaches or suggests evaluating the added information relevant to the dispatch of the message to determine an appropriate message processing method based on those portions of information added to the modified message, as recited in claim 1. At least for either of these reasons, claim 1 patentably defines over the art of record. At least for either of these reasons, claims 18, 32 and 34 also patentably define over the art of record. Since each of the dependent claims depend from one of claims 1, 18, 32 and 34, each of the dependent claims also patentably define over the art of record for at least either of the same reasons.

Although each of the dependent claims patentably define over the prior art of record for the same reasons as their corresponding base claims, many of the dependent claims also independently distinguish over the prior art of record. For example, the prior art of record fails to disclose or suggest wherein the plurality of relevant dispatch elements includes at least two of the following: the connection over which the message was received, the protocol type used to receive the message, the time that the message was received, a handling priority of the message, a status of a sender of the message and a current processing load of the receiving computing system, as recited in claim 39.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (801) 533-9800.

Dated this 11th day of September, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,

/GREGORY R. LUNT/

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
GREGORY R. LUNT
Registration No. 57,354
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973

RDN:GRL:cj
1859232_1.DOC